



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Rutten contacted Mr. Hanke to discuss an examiner's amendment to the independent claims. Mr. Rutten indicated that the 11/26/07 claim amendments appeared to overcome the 102 rejections, but that new art was found (US 5,371,742 to Brown et al.) to provide the basis for a 103 rejection. However, a new reading of claims 30 and 32 revealed patentable subject matter, and that if the limitations of those claims were incorporated into the independent claims then the case would be allowable. Mr. Hanke essentially agreed to the proposal, but suggested that he review the claims and fax a copy of the changes. After review of the claims, Mr. Rutten called Mr. Hanke on 3/17/08 to further clarify what appeared to be a typo in the proposed language. Mr. Hanke agreed to change "said element object is a virtual element" to "said element object and a virtual element" in the proposed amended language.